

ay



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,697	02/25/2004	Mathew T. Abraham	010886.00633	3661

22908 7590 09/27/2005
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
TEN SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3000
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

SELLERS, DANIEL R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2644

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/786,697

Applicant(s)

ABRAHAM, MATHEW T.

Examiner

Daniel R. Sellers

Art Unit

2644

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).


10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See the attachment.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

13. ☐ Other: _____.


WIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The rejection of claims 1-25 is maintained. Claims 1-11 are rejected as being anticipated by Miller and claims 12-25 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Miller and Jaeger.
3. Regarding claim 1, Miller teaches a room equalization system, which can remove acoustic feedback as cited previously (Col. 6, lines 55-61 and Fig. 5, units 20a and 20b). Miller teaches that incoming signals are monitored for acoustic feedback and adjustments are made appropriately using the automatic equalizers for the purpose of reducing feedback in the original broadcast signal. Miller also teaches that automatic equalizers can synchronize the response analysis between channels in a multi-channel arrangement (Col. 7, lines 52-57). It is inherent that synchronizing a response to feedback includes sharing information. There is no indication in the claim language that the feedback path is between an on-stage microphone (Fig. 3, unit 28) versus an ambient microphone (Fig. 3, unit 40) and the loudspeakers. There is also no limitation indicating a response in real-time to a feedback component. Miller therefore teaches the features of claim 1.
4. Regarding claim 3, Miller teaches an adaptive equalizer using adaptive coefficients. It is inherent that the frequency response of an adaptive filter, which adapts to a feedback component, will behave as a filter with a notch frequency placed at the frequency corresponding to the feedback component.

Art Unit: 2644

5. Regarding claim 12, the combination of Miller and Jaeger teach the features of claim 12. Miller teaches a synchronization of response analyses, wherein it is inherent that a process of synchronization requires information to be shared. The response analysis is the system's analysis of the frequency response of the system, wherein information regarding acoustic feedback is inherently included. Miller teaches that the responses are synchronized in a multi-channel system. In light of Jaeger's teachings, it is obvious to share filters to preserve the stereo image, wherein one skilled in the art would deduce that synchronizing a feedback response would filter any acoustic feedback equally to preserve the stereo image.